

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 are rejected.

The independent claims have been amended herein to clarify applicant's claimed invention. For example several of the claims have been clarified to recite that the information distribution device is connected with terminal device or devices belongs to a group constituted by a plurality of terminal devices. The amendment is aimed to clarify that the terminals are outside of the information distribution device, for example, any terminal group can be served by making contact with the information distribution device, and by registering in it.

Claims 1, 4, 6-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kamentsky et al. (Kamentsky) and claims 2-3, 5, 8 and 11-20 as unpatentable over Kamentsky.

In the previous Office Action the Examiner clarifies the rejection of claim 1 by stating that applicant's information distribution device is equivalent to Kamentsky's targeted promotion delivery system 200 of Fig. 1 not including 240. It's argued in the Office Action that claim 1 does not clearly convey that the terminal device from which a distribution request is submitted is not part of the information distribution device. In the Office Action it's put forth that Kamentsky deals with the information distribution device and the terminal device as one unit.

In contrast to Kamentsky, applicant's terminal device is outside of the information distribution device. For example in claim 1 the information distribution device is connected with a plurality of terminal devices which belong to a group, and from which identical information is distributed to said terminal devices.

In addition applicant's claimed invention, in claim 1, includes distributing the distribution information to a terminal device which is judged included. This is not found in the prior art. Because applicant's terminals are outside the information distribution device, any terminal group

can be served by making contract with the information distribution device, and by having its address in the second storage portion.

In addition in claim 1, the second receiving portion is accessing the distribution information stored in a content server which exists outside of said information distribution device. It is insisted in the Office Action that Kamentsky's BULK DATA SERVER 230 receiving information from PROMOTION MANAGER SERVER 220 is the same as applicant's claimed invention. However, only information owned by the information distribution device can be distributed in such a way as taught by Kamentsky.

In contrast because of applicant's claimed features information accessible through internet, for example, may be distributed to the terminal devices specified in a request. Thus applicant's claimed invention is different because the information to be distributed is outside of the information distribution device and in claim 1 it is specified that the distribution information is in a content server which exists outside of the information distribution device, and that distribution information is received by accessing the content server.

In applicant's claim 1 the first transmitting portion, specifies that distribution is done in the case where the destination received by the first receiving portion is stored in the first storing portion. By doing this, the destination is determined before a terminal sends the request. In Kamentsky, the destination of the distribution information is not on the SCHEDULE REQUEST 1. In Kamentsky the destination is determined with view history and statistical analysis.

In claims 11, 17 and 20 the terminal device belongs to a group of terminal devices, where the access information being required for accessing distribution information for distribution to one or more of the terminal devices belonging to the group, said distribution destination

information specifying a distribution destination terminal device belonging to said group. The reference fails to teach these feature.

In claims 16, 18, and 19 the distribution information is stored in a content server which exists outside of said information distribution device, based on said access information included in said received distribution request, to receive the distribution information; and includes judging whether a terminal device specified by said distribution destination information is an address of a terminal device included in said terminal information, to distribute said received distribution information to said terminal device which is judged included.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully requested the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJH 18.876 (100794-00138)
BSM:fd